

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ESEA FLEXIBILITY
Extension/Amendment Submission
May 12, 2014

Dear Assistant Secretary:

I am writing on behalf of the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (DC OSSE) to request approval to amend the District of Columbia's approved ESEA flexibility request. The relevant information, outlined in the Department's *ESEA Flexibility Amendment Submission Process* document, is provided in the table below.

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
Consultation	Detailed DC OSSE's collaboration with LEAs, educators, and the public during the development of DC's initial ESEA Flexibility Request in 2012	Updates to this section detail DC OSSE's collaboration with LEAs, educators, and the public since original request in 2012.	Updating to provide current information.	Posted on website for public comment.
Overview	Provided a description of how implementation of DC's ESEA Flexibility Request in 2012 would support reforms already in place in DC.	Historical updates explain how the reforms have been implemented since 2012.	Updating to provide current information	Posted on website for public comment.
Principle 1B	Described DC's adoption and implementation of CCSS	Contains timeline updates since the adoption to include other standards such as NGSS, English language development standards, and early learning standards.	Updating historical information	Posted on website for public comment.
Principle 1B: Principle	Originally planned for the inclusion of the SY 2012-2013 DC science	Now the request has been amended to state that the NGSS assessment will be	DC SBOE formally adopted the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) in	Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
2Aii	assessments into the statewide accountability system. Therefore, initially the school classifications in the SY 2014-2015 would have been based, in part, on the DC science assessment.	<p>included in the accountability for the first time using the SY15-16 assessment results.</p> <p>Therefore, the results of the assessment would be included in the SY 16-17 accountability classifications.</p>	<p>December 2013 paving the way for aggressive realignment of the DC science assessment.</p> <p>The delayed inclusion is in response to LEA requests to allow time for more District educators to be involved in the blueprint development, item review, data analysis, and professional development related to teaching to the newly adopted Next Generation Science Standards.</p> <p>This timeline will facilitate a positive transition plan for including new subjects while supporting schools and educators through the transition.</p>	<p>public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p>
Principle 1B 1Bi	Established timeline for Implementation of CCSS and alignment to assessment	Updates timeline based on historical implementation and recent changes.	<p>Includes updates such as the DC SBOE's adoption of the NGSS in Dec 2013.</p> <p>Now clarifies the optional DC CAS assessment in Gr 2 and 9</p>	Posted on website for public comment.
Principle 2Bii	Originally the section omits composition from the index scores in the tables although it was a part of the rollout to	Now includes composition as a component in the accountability system and index scores.	The school index score is a weighted average of the value-table points assigned in reading, composition, and mathematics combined. The	Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
	include composition in accountability in other parts of the waiver application.		<p>addition of “composition” to the table clarifies that composition was to be added and was added to the accountability system in the 2012-2013 SY.</p> <p>This combined index identifies priority, reward, developing and rising schools.</p>	
Principle 2Diii	<p>Describes the Interventions aligned with the 7 turnaround principles that an LEA w Priority schools will implement.</p> <p>Originally the request states that DC OSSE will monitor schools and PCSB/DCPS around school improvement practices.</p>	Clarifies that OSSE will work directly with DCPS and PCSB and that DCPS and PCSB teams will work with schools.	<p>Believe that whenever possible, LEAs/authorizers should be the point of intervention with failing schools.</p> <p>Both DCPS and PCSB have dedicated teams to support struggling schools, with staff who work directly with school leaders to facilitate the changes necessary to accelerate student achievement.</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p>
Principle 2Diii	Originally the table for Priority schools does not show a planning year and	Amended to reflect a planning year. Also amended to reflect that	Clarifies that a planning year is a necessary component of the school improvement process	Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
	has OSSE's role in years 1 and 2 as reviewing school plans and making recommendations.	<p>OSSE's role in year 1 and year 2 of implementation will be monitoring DCPS and PCSB against their plans and performance indicators.</p> <p>In Year 3 of implementation, OSSE will move to a more direct role of approving school plans and prescribing use of 20 percent set-aside.</p>	<p>and is not a part of the implementation year.</p> <p>Reflects a belief that whenever possible, LEAs/authorizers should be the point of intervention with schools.</p> <p>Clarifies the theory of action of OSSE's direct approval and review of plans in implementation of Year 3 if sufficient progress is not made.</p>	<p>public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p>
Principle 2Eiii	Originally the request states that DC OSSE will monitor schools and PCSB/DCPS around school improvement practices.	Clarifies that OSSE will work directly with DCPS and PCSB and that DCPS and PCSB teams will work with schools.	<p>Believe that whenever possible, LEAs/authorizers should be the point of intervention with schools.</p> <p>Both DCPS and PCSB have dedicated teams to support struggling schools, with staff who work directly with school leaders to facilitate the changes necessary to accelerate student achievement.</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board meeting.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title</p>

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
				III Community of Practice.
Principle 2F	The current language states that LEAs must dedicate a portion of the 20% Title I set aside for schools that missed AMOs	Removes the requirement to dedicate the set-aside to schools that missed AMOs. Outlines additional supports available to these schools from OSSE.	LEAs expressed a desire to target the 20% set aside to schools that need it the most—Priority and Focus schools. Including AMO schools would result in this portion of Title I funds being dispersed too broadly. This approach is likely to not make a meaningful impact in the most struggling schools.	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice..</p>

Attached to this chart is a redlined version of the pages from our approved ESEA flexibility request that would be impacted with strikeouts and additions to demonstrate how the request would change with approval of the proposed amendments. Please contact Iris Bond Gill at iris.bond-gill@dc.gov or by phone at 202-340-2905 if you have any questions about these proposed amendments.

DC OSSE acknowledges that the U.S. Department of Education may request supplementary information to inform consideration of this request.

Chief State School Officer

Date